

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in reply to the Final Office Action dated October 15, 2007. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and further examination of the patent application pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.113.

Summary of the Examiner's Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bickford (US 2004/0236504).

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickford (US 2004/0236504) in further view of DeLorme (US 6,321,158).

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickford (US 2004/0236504) in view of DeLorme (US 6,321,158) and in further view of Buckham (US 6,662,016).

Claims 10-14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by DeLorme (US 6,321,158).

Claims 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeLorme (US 6,321,158) as modified by Buckham (US 6,662,016).

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeLorme (US 6,321,158) as modified by Buckham (US 6,662,016) and further in view of Ohmura (US 6,208,932).

Claims 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickford (US 2004/0236504) in view of Odagawa (US 2005/0143915).

Summary of Amendment

Applicants have amended Claims 1-4, 7-8, 10-11, 13 and 17-18, and added Claim 21 to more particularly define the present invention. No new subject matter has been added.

Rejection Language in Office Action

The Examiner in the past two Office Actions has failed to identify how the cited features of the reference(s) correspond to each of the specific limitations in the Applicant's independent claims. In particular, the rejection language has been structured as a narrative which makes it difficult if not impossible for the Applicants to understand how the Examiner believes the cited references anticipate the specific limitations of the Applicant's independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that if the Examiner has future rejections that he specifically identify the features in the cited reference(s) and how those features correspond to each of the specific limitations in the Applicant's independent claims.

Remarks regarding § 102 and § 103 rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bickford (US 2004/0236504). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections since Bickford is not prior art to the present patent application. In particular, Bickford was filed on May 22, 2003 and the present patent application has claimed priority to a PCT Patent Application PCT/SE04/00768 filed on May 12, 2003. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of the pending rejections and allowance of Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-9.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickford (US 2004/0236504) in further view of DeLorme (US 6,321,158). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections since Bickford is not prior art to the present patent application. In particular, Bickford was filed on May 22, 2003 and the present patent application has claimed priority to a PCT Patent Application PCT/SE04/00768 filed on May 12, 2003. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of the pending rejection and allowance of Claim 3.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickford (US 2004/0236504) in view of DeLorme (US 6,321,158) and in further view of

Buckham (US 6,662,016). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections since Bickford is not prior art to the present patent application. In particular, Bickford was filed on May 22, 2003 and the present patent application has claimed priority to a PCT Patent Application PCT/SE04/00768 filed on May 12, 2003. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of the pending rejection and allowance of Claim 6.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 10 is patentable over DeLorme. The new independent Claim 10 recites the following:

10. (Currently Amended) A method for producing guiding information for a user in a vehicle, said method comprising the steps of:

processing information compiled from a plurality of information sources to generate a specification of a message comprising at least one information object, wherein said specification message includes information for retrieval of specified information related to said at least one information object;

forming presentation information at least partly according to the specification message, where said forming step further includes:

determining a preferred medium for presentation of information related to said at least one information object in a first format according to said specification message, and determining an alternative medium for presentation in a second format;

retrieving presentation information associated with said at least one information object according to said specification message and selected format; and

outputting said presentation information on a selected one of said preferred medium and said alternative medium.

In the Office Action, the Examiner correctly cited DeLorme to indicate that it is known where information may be received from a number of information sources and a number of media may be used for presentation (see abstract in DeLorme). In the prior art, information is normally selected from one of the sources at a time according to the importance of the information and presented on a suitable medium. In DeLorme, for example, the Integrated Routing/Mapping Information System (IRMIS) selects information having a high priority such that a next turn along the user's planned route can be identified by an audible signal (see abstract in DeLorme).

However, the present invention recited in amended independent Claim 10 first forms a specification message, which can be regarded as a form of meta-representation of the information to be presented to the user, and in a second stage forms the actual presentation information. For example, the specification message is used as the base for subsequent retrieval of presentation information associated with at least one information object. In other words, the specification message is not (or at least not exclusively) the presentation content itself, but relates to properties such as type, structure and location of the information (see paragraphs [0036]-[0041] and FIGS. 1-2 in the patent application). This distinction between the specification message and the actual presentation message is clear in the amended independent Claim 10 in that the presentation information is formed according to the specification message and that information associated with the information object(s) is retrieved according to the specification message and selected format. This is also supported by exemplary FIG. 3 of the present application, which shows that a specification (S) is generated, e.g., by a designated specification unit 321 in a navigation manager 320, and transferred to a presentation manager 340, which prepares the information to be presented at least partly in accordance with the specification (S) (see paragraphs [0042]-[0050] in the patent application).

In the claimed invention, the compiled information from the plurality of information sources is processed to generate a specification of a message that is at least partly used for forming the actual presentation information. The specification message includes at least one information object and information for retrieval of specified information related to the at least one information object. Then, the specification message is at least partly used to form presentation information where in doing this a preferred medium is determined for presentation of information related to the at least one information object in a first format according to the specification message, and an alternative medium is determined for presentation in a second format. Thereafter, the presentation information is retrieved that is associated with the at least one information object according to the specification message and the selected format. Finally, the

presentation information is presented on a selected one of the preferred medium and the alternative medium. Applicants respectfully submit that DeLorme fails to teach or suggest these claimed elements of the amended independent Claim 10. And, Buckham and Ohmura do not cure these defects. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the amended independent Claim 10 and it's associated dependent Claims 11-18 are patentable in view of DeLorme, Buckham and Ohmura.

Claims 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickford (US 2004/0236504) in view of Odagawa (US 2005/0143915). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections since both Bickford and Odagawa are not considered prior art to the present patent application. In particular, Bickford was filed on May 22, 2003 and the present patent application has claimed priority to a PCT Patent Application PCT/SE04/00768 which was filed on May 12, 2003. And, Odagawa claims priority to a JP patent application dated December 8, 2003 while the present patent application has claimed priority to a PCT Patent Application PCT/SE04/00768 filed on May 12, 2003. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of the pending rejection and allowance of Claims 19-20.

Applicants have added new independent Claim 21 which recites limitations which are similar to the ones in the amended independent Claim 10 and as such the aforementioned remarks regarding the patentability of amended independent Claim 10 apply as well to the new independent Claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that new independent Claim 21 is patentable view of DeLorme, Buckham and Ohmura.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds of the rejections have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of all outstanding rejections and allowance of pending Claims 1-21.

Applicants authorize the Commissioner to charge the \$210 fee for the new independent claim and any other fees which may be required for this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-1379.

The undersigned Attorney requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.



Thomas Bethea, Jr.
Registration No. 53,987

Date: 12/14/2007

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4859
thomas.bethea.jr@ericsson.com